

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as currently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9-16, and 18-30 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 5, 10, and 14 are amended and Claims 27-30 are added by the present amendment.

Claim amendments and new claims find support in the claims and specification as originally filed at least at page 9, lines 16-23, and Claims 8 and 17. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1, 2, 7-11, 16-20, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,246,342 to Vandevoorde et al. (herein "Vandevoorde"); Claims 3 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vandevoorde in view of Mapquest; and Claims 4-6, 13-15, 21, 22, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vandevoorde in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,121,900 to Takishita.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of Claims 1, 2, 7-11, 16-20, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Vandevoorde and of Claims 4-6, 13-15, 21, 22, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vandevoorde in view of Takishita, with respect to amended Claims 1 and 10.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to an airport display device that includes, in part, a display, a database including data related to an airport, and a selector configured to select a degree of zoom for an airport image to be displayed, the airport image corresponding to the airport. The selector includes, in part, a selection mechanism configured to center the view of the airport on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the airport each time the selection mechanism is activated. Amended Claim 10 includes similar features.

In other words, the display is automatically centered on a different predetermined portion of the airport upon each activation of the selection mechanism.¹ Further, as recited in Claims 5 and 14, the different predetermined portions of the airport are displayed in a cyclic fashion. That is, a predetermined portion is displayed for a second time after each predetermined portion is displayed for a first time.

Applicants respectfully submit that Vandevoorde and Takishita do not teach or suggest each feature of the amended independent claims. In particular, Vandevoorde and Takishita, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest any selection mechanism to center the view of an airport on a different predetermined portion of the airport each time the selection mechanism is activated. Vandevoorde is silent regarding the claimed selection mechanism, and the Office Action relies on Takishita regarding related features in Claims 5 and 14 as previously presented. Takishita shows a detailed map in Figs. 3(1)-3(4) that scrolls based on a movement of a “rectangular cursor CSR indicating the rectangular area AR surrounding the vehicle.”² Further, Takishita indicates that as the vehicle travels on the road RD, the cursor CSR moves on the map, and the cursor screen scrolls the detailed map in accordance with the movement of the cursor CSR.³ In other words, the displayed detailed map area of Takishita scrolls based on a current location of a vehicle, and the view in the map display is not associated or centered upon any predetermined locations. Further, the map view of Takishita is not displayed as a result of each activation of a selection mechanism. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Vandevoorde and Takishita do not teach or suggest “a selection mechanism configured to center the view of the airport on a different one of plural predetermined portions of the airport each time the selection mechanism is

¹ Specification at page 9, lines 16-23.

² Takishita at column 2, lines 49-50.

³ Takishita at column 3, lines 5-11.

activated,” as recited in independent Claim 1 and as similarly recited in independent Claim 10.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 10, and claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Vandevoorde and Takishita.

Further, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of Claims 3 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vandevoorde in view of Mapquest. Claims 3 and 12 depend from Claims 1 and 10, respectively, which as discussed above are believed to patentably define over Vandevoorde. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Mapquest also does not supply the claimed features lacking in the disclosure of Vandevoorde.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that rejection be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 10, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Philippe J.C. Signore, Ph.D.
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 43,922

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Zachary S. Stern
Registration No. 54,719

PJCS:ZSS:dnf